

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 20 remain in the application and stand finally rejected. Claims 1 – 18 are amended by this proposed amendment. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 – 20 are finally rejected under 35 USC §112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Partially responsive thereto, claims 1 – 18 are amended herein to address the alleged indefinite recitations.

With regard to claims 1 and 9, the title of the present application is “**Visual Job Ticketing** Using a Document Viewing Application.” Title, page 1, line 1 (emphasis added). “A standard document viewing application, such as Adobe Acrobat Exchange, Microsoft Word or others, is used with **plug in** enhancements to display a document to be printed and visual feedback cues associated with user selected print job parameters.” Abstract, page 13, lines 4 – 7 (emphasis added). Inherently, therefore, the plug-in(s) is(are) a visual job ticketing plug-in(s). Further,

the present invention comprises a set of **plug-ins** to an existing, standard document viewing application, to **let job originators** specify job ticket parameters for the entire document and for individual pages and page groups. The **plug-ins also** display visual cues in the document to provide feedback to the job originator about which parameters have been set.

Paragraph 0006 (emphasis added). So, the visual job ticketing plug-in(s) provide additional functionality to the “an existing, standard document viewing application,”

Accordingly, claims 1 and 9 are amended to recite that a visual job ticketing plug-in(s) is (are) providing the visual job ticketing capability to the viewing application. This is supported by the specification, supra, and by claims 6 and 14, as filed. Claims 6 and 14 are also amended responsive to the amendment to claims 1 and 9.

Further,

[w]hen executing with a document viewing application program as described above, **the plug-ins** of the present invention **insert visual feedback** directly into the source document (for example, adding a dog-ear corner to the upper right page corner to show duplex printing, see FIG. 2), so **any user interactions** in the source document **apply to the visual feedback** as well. For example, as the user moves pages around in the document, the visual feedback moves with the page automatically. When the **visual cues are added to the document**, **the plug-ins keep track** of the objects to which they have added themselves and which were in the document originally. Preferably, **the plug-ins add** a hidden or unseen marker to the visual cue objects, but alternatively **the plug-ins could keep a list** of visual cue object IDs. When the **document is** to be saved or **printed, the plug-ins search** each page for visual cue objects **and remove** them, so that the saved or printed document does not include the cues. Also, when the visual cue objects are removed, the plug-ins **locate any unseen markers** that may have been previously inserted. For example, dog-ear corners are very useful when editing the job ticket in the application, but are not desirable in the printed output document. The job ticket parameters represented by the visual cues are stored or printed via the job ticket instead.

Paragraph 0014 (emphasis added). This also (“When the **document is** to be saved or **printed, the plug-ins search** each page”) clearly supports “wherein the specific operation is initiating a print” as recited in claims 3 and 11; and the recitations of claims 2 and 10, as well.

The plug-ins of this invention **monitor** the user’s commands to the application, such as page moves, insertions, deletions, document switching, document close, document open, and so on so they can **adjust the job ticket** representation according to the user’s actions. **The plug-ins** can, subject to application limitations, **restrict** user actions to those that are compatible with job ticketing.

Paragraph 0016 (emphasis added). At the very least, adjusting the job ticket amends the document, i.e., the plug-ins create the amended document as recited by claims 1 and 9.

The plug-ins of this invention **monitor** the user’s current page selection (for example, via the thumbnail view) and **apply job ticketing page exceptions** to the selected pages. **The plug-ins can**, subject to application limitations, **adjust the selection** as needed to be compatible with job

ticketing. The **plug-ins can also adjust the enabled job ticketing actions** to be compatible with the current selection.

Paragraph 0017 (emphasis added). Moreover, “**The plug-ins** of this invention extend **the application’s user interface** (for example, by adding new menu items and dialogs) to let the user **invoke job ticketing functions.**” Paragraph 0018 (emphasis added). Those functions include “Create/Modify document attributes” and “Print Job with Ticket Parameters.” Paragraphs 0019 – 29.

Further, with regard to claims 1 – 3 and 9 – 11, if the allegation is that the specification fails to recite “specific operations;” the specification is amended to provide support. The amendment to the specification is supported by claims 1 – 3 and 9 – 11 as filed. “In establishing a disclosure, applicant may rely not only on the specification and drawing as filed but also on the original claims if their content justifies it.” MPEP §608.01(I) & 608.04. Entry of the amendment, reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection of claims 1 – 3 and 9 – 11 under 35 USC §112 is respectfully requested.

With regard to claims 4 and 12 and 5 and 13, the Final Office Action (Final) specifically asserts that the specification fails to describe locating and removing markers; and to describe inserting or removing visual cue objects. The specification clearly provides that “the plug-ins ... insert visual feedback directly into the source document ... the visual cues are added to the document,” and that “the plug-ins add a hidden or unseen **marker to the visual cue objects**, but alternatively the plug-ins could keep a **list** of visual cue object IDs. When the document is to be saved or printed, the **plug-ins search** each page for visual cue objects **and remove them**, so that the saved or printed document does not include the cues.” Paragraph 0014 (emphasis added). Therefore, the specification describes one or more *plug-ins* locating and removing hidden or unseen markers; and inserting and/or removing visual cue objects. Accordingly, claims 4, 5, 12 and 13 are amended to reflect that a *plug-ins* locates and removes hidden or unseen markers; and inserts and/or removes visual cue objects. Entry of the amendment,

reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection of claims 4, 5, 12 and 13 under 35 USC §112 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, as set forth hereinabove, no new matter is added by this amendment to the specification and claims 1 – 18. Having amended the specification and the claims, all claims are believed to be supported by the specification. Entry of the amendment, reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection of amended claims 1 – 20 under 35 USC §112 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 – 20 are finally rejected under 35 USC §112 as being unclear as to whether the “displayed document” in claims 1 and 9 corresponds to the “original document” or the “amended document.” While applicants believe it to be clear from the claims that when the original document is loaded, the displayed document is the original document until it is amended; claims 1 and 9 are further amended by this proposed amendment to more clearly indicate the differences. Entry of the amendment, reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection of amended claims 1 – 20 under 35 USC §112 is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 – 16, 19 and 20 are finally rejected under 35 USC §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Responsive thereto, claim 9 is amended as suggested in the Final. Entry of the amendment, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 – 16, 19 and 20 under 35 USC §101 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 – 5 and 9 – 13 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,614,454 to Livingston in combination with U.S. Patent No. 5,999,945 to Lahey et al. Claims 6 – 8 and 14 – 16 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Livingston and Lahey et al. in view of published U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0184305 to Simpson et al. Claims 17 and 19 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Livingston and

Lahey et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,268,924 to Koppolu et al. Claims 18 and 20 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Livingston, Lahey et al. and Simpson et al. in view of Koppolu et al.

Responding to the previous amendment, the Final asserts “that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., invoking the system by viewing the document) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).” Final, #1.a., page 2. As noted hereinabove, claims 1 and 9 are amended by this proposed amendment to recite that the visual job ticketing function is being provided by a visual job ticketing plug-in(s) to the viewing application.

A plug-in is a set of software components that do not stand alone, but add specific capabilities to a larger software application, i.e., a document viewing application. *See, e.g.,* [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Plug-in_\(computing\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Plug-in_(computing)). Plugs-in may be loaded when the application is loaded or when the need arises. Web browser plug-ins, for example, typically load when a page includes content requiring the plug-in(s) and/or in response to selecting the content.

Livingston teaches a “printer control system [that] includes memory ... [with a] document to be printed, a print engine ... to print a document ... and a display configured to provide an image of a graphical user interface in a viewing window.” *See, e.g.,* Livingston, Figure 3A and col. 2, lines 12 – 18. As previously noted, the GUI in the Livingston printer control system “is configured to allow user selection and modification of print engine options for printing the document.” *Id.*, lines 19 – 22. More specifically, one can use the Livingston printer control system GUI to configure the system printer, selecting print engine options to configure/control the printer. Thus, Livingston operates on the printer, not the document being printed and obviates the need for/inclusion of print job tickets in/with the document. Neither is the Livingston GUI used or opened independent of the printer control function, i.e., as a document viewing application without the printer control function, i.e., *sans* visual job ticketing plug-in.

Further, Livingston fails to even mention job tickets, much less modifying or creating a job ticket in the Livingston printer control system for the Livingston printer. Neither does Livingston teach or suggest interactions with the Livingston printer control system GUI modifying the document other than for printer functions, i.e., as document viewing application. Applicants note that stapling (mentioned in the Final, #1.b, page 2) is a printer function. Further, the Livingston printer control system GUI is not invoked as a plug-in for the document viewing application or by viewing the document in the document viewing application; the “print preview image” is viewed because the Livingston printer control system is active.

Lahey et al., which the Final relies on to teach printing an amended document responsive to a print job ticket, teaches “organizing the component files and the job tickets in a common directory.” Col. 1, lines 62 – 64. Further, Lahey et al. teaches a GUI that operates solely on print tickets. Figures 2 – 10 and 12, col. 7, line 46 – col. 12, line 19. “FIG. 12 is a flowchart that illustrates more specific logic performed by the InfoPrint Submit software 10 when the GUIJ [sic] 60 is displayed as indicated at 114.” *Id.*, col. 12, lines 4 – 6. Lahey et al. describes creating job tickets on client systems 4a, b, c, and submitting those jobs to a server 6. *Id.*, col. 7, lines 15 – 25. The Lahey et al. server 6 corresponds to the Livingston printer control system. “The user [on client systems 4a, b or c] creates the job ticket 40 by entering information into different fields and selecting specific options presented in the GUI 60.” *Id.*, lines 50 – 53.

However, Lahey et al. neither teaches or suggests “including in the document viewing application at least one visual job ticketing plug-in providing a visual job ticketing interface” as claims 1 and 9 are amended to recite. Therefore, the combination of Livingston and Lahey et al. fails to result in the present invention as recited in the claims 1 and 9, as amended, and all claims depending therefrom. Entry of the amendment, reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection of claims 1 – 5 and 9 – 13 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully requested.

With regard to claims 6 – 8 and 14 – 16, the Final again relies on Simpson et al. to teach a “plug in to a document editor providing a plug in interface (page 1, paragraph 3).” Page 10.

As previously noted, Simpson et al. describes using an Adobe Acrobat *web browser* plug-in to preview web page print output. Simpson et al. page 1, paragraph 3, lines 1 – 9. Moreover, Simpson et al. indicates that the resulting preview may be inaccurate. *Id.*, lines 9 – 17. Therefore, Simpson et al. indicates that using an Adobe Acrobat *web browser* plug-in to preview web pages in combination with Livingston and Lahey et al. provides inadequate and, possibly undesirable, results. Such a combination of Livingston and Lahey et al. with Simpson et al. is, therefore, not an obvious combination, and therefore, would not render the present invention *prima facie* obvious.

Furthermore, neither does Simpson et al. teach nor suggest “including in the document viewing application at least one visual job ticketing plug-in providing a visual job ticketing interface” as claims 1 and 9 are amended to recite. Therefore, the combination of Livingston, Lahey et al. and Simpson et al. fails to teach, suggest, result in or make *prima facie* obvious the present invention as recited in the claims 6 and 14, as finally ejected and as amended. Entry of the amendment, reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection of claims 6 – 8 and 14 – 16 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully requested.

With regard to claims 17 – 20, the Office Action relies on Koppolou et al. to teach thumbnail print previews. While Koppolu et al. teaches “displaying the plurality of visual cue objects in thumbnails” (col. 6, lines 36 – 37), Koppolu et al. does not provide anything to teach or suggest what is missing from Livingston and Lahey et al., alone or further in combination with Simpson et al., to result in the present invention as recited in amended claims 1 or 9, much less claims 17 – 20 depending therefrom. Accordingly, since dependent claims include all of the differences with the references as the claims

from which they depend, Koppolu et al. in combination with Livingston and Lahey et al., alone or further in *non-obvious* combination with Simpson et al. does not teach, suggest or result in the present invention, as recited in claims 17 – 20. Entry of the amendment, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17 – 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Koppolu et al. in combination with Livingston and Lahey et al., alone, or further in (*non-obvious*) combination with Simpson et al., is respectfully requested.

The applicants thank the Examiner for efforts, both past and present, in examining the application. Believing the application to be in condition for allowance, both for the amendment to the claims and for the reasons set forth above, the applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment, reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection of claims 1 – 20 under 35 U.S.C. §§101, 112 and 103(a) and allowance of the application to issue.

Should anything further be required, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number listed below for a telephonic or personal interview to discuss any other changes. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 50-3669 and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully Submitted,

October 18, 2010
(Date)

/Charles W. Peterson, Jr., #34,406/
Charles W. Peterson, Jr.
Registration No. 34,406

Customer No. 56,989
Law Office of Charles W. Peterson, Jr.
435B Carlisle Dr.
Herndon, VA 20170
Telephone: (703) 481-0532
Facsimile: (703) 481-0585